Receipt Number

540922-

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

GEOFFREY NELS FIEGER & RICHARD L. STEINBERG,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

SOLTHEFILD, MICHIGAN 43077-2455 • TELEPRONS (248, 355-5555 • PAX (24s) 355-5148

1999; WEST TEN MILE ROAD

HEGER, PHYRER, KENNEY & JOHNSON + A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION → ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

Case: 2:06-cv-11684
Assigned To: Tarnow, Arthur J
Referral Judge: Majzoub, Mona K
Filed: 04-07-2006 At 01:37 PM
CMP FIEGER, ET AL V. MI SUPREME COU
RT, ET AL (TAM)

MAGISTRATE JUDGE

MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT, CLIFFORD W. TAYLOR, MICHAEL F. CAVANAGH, ELIZABETH A. WEAVER, MARILYN KELLY, MAURA D. CORRRIGAN, ROBERT P. YOUNG, JR., STEPHEN J. MARKMAN, In their official capacities,

Defendants.

MICHAEL R. DEZSI (P64530)
Counsel for Plaintiffs
FIEGER, FIEGER, KENNEY & JOHNSON, P.C.,
19390 W. Ten Mile Rd.
Southfield, MI 48075
(248) 355-5555

# COMPLAINT

NOW COMES Plaintiffs, Geoffrey N. Fieger and Richard L. Steinberg, by and through counsel, and brings this Complaint against the above named Defendants. In support of their Complaint, Plaintiffs state the following:

- 1. Plaintiffs Geoffrey N. Fieger and Richard L. Steinberg, are, and at all relevant times were, duly licensed attorneys admitted to practice law before the Michigan courts.
- 2. Defendant Michigan Supreme Court, comprised of each of the above named justices in their official capacities, is the government agency responsible for the promulgation,

6

- 3. Jurisdiction is conferred upon this Honorable Court by 28 U.S.C. § 1331, this being a civil action arising under the Constitution and the laws of the United States.
- 4. Jurisdiction is also conferred upon this Court by 28 U.S.C. § 1343(a)(3) and (4), 28 U.S.C. § 2201 & 2202, and 42 U.S.C. § 1983 & 1988, this being an action for declaratory judgment and equitable relief authorized by law to redress deprivations under color of law of rights, privileges, and immunities secured by the United States Constitution.
- 5. At all times relevant to this Complaint, and in taking all of the actions described in this Complaint, Defendants have acted and threatened to act under color of law and were effecting, and will effect, the custom, policies, rules, and laws of the State of Michigan.

### FACTS GIVING RISE TO PLAINTIFF'S CONSTITUTIONAL CLAIMS

- 6. Plaintiffs, and all other attorneys duly licensed to practice law in the State of Michigan, are subject to Michigan's Rules of Professional Conduct ("MRPC).
- 7. Failure to comply with an obligation or prohibition imposed by the MRPC subjects Plaintiff and all other licensed attorneys to the disciplinary proceedings of the Michigan Supreme Court.
- 8. Rule 3.5(c) of the MRPC provides that "A lawyer shall not engage in undignified or discourteous conduct toward the tribunal."
- Rule 6.5 of the MRPC provides that "A lawyer shall treat with courtesy and respect all persons involved in the legal process."
- 10. As a direct result of MRPC 3.5 and 6.5, Plaintiff, and all other duly licenses attorneys, face the constant threat of disciplinary proceedings, up to and including revocation of licensure, for engaging in truthful, nonmisleading, constitutionally protected expression.

FIEGH, FIEGH, KENNEY & JOHNSON & A PROPESSIONAL CORPORATION \* ATTORNEYS AND COLVSELORS ATLAW \* 1930 WEST TEN MELE ROAD \* SOUTHICELD, MICHIGAN 18075-463 \* TELEPHONE 22-3, 355-555 \* 1-3 Y 1281 355-5148

## COUNT I

- 11. Plaintiffs incorporates paragraphs 1-10 of their Complaint herein.
- 12. Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct 3.5(c) and 6.5 are unconstitutional on their face and violate the First and Fourteenth Amendments for the following reasons:
  - (a) Rules 3.5(c) and 6.5 unconstitutionally abridge freedom of speech and expression;
  - (b) Rules 3.5(c) and 6.5 do not further a compelling government interest;
  - (c) Rules 3.5(c) and 6.5 are not the least restrictive means to further any governmental interest, compelling or otherwise;
  - (d) Rules 3.5(c) and 6.5 are unconstitutionally vague and overly broad.
- 13. For these reasons, Plaintiffs, and all other duly licensed attorneys, are threatened with irreparable harm for which there is no adequate remedy at law.

PEGER, PEGER, KENNEY & JOENSON + A PROPESSIONAL CORPORATION + A TRORNEYS AND COUNSELORS ATLAW + 1930 WEST TEN MILE ROAD + SOUTHFIELD, MCHIGAN 48035-2463 + TELEPHONE (24), 385-363 + EAX - 24(2), 255-348

# PEGER, FEGER, KENNEY & JOHNSON \* A WORESSIONAL CREPORATION \* ATTORNEYS AND COLNEE, ORS AT LAW \* 1999 WEST TO MILE ROAD \* SOLTHERED, MICHORAL MITSCLAS\*\* THE PHONE TAR, 33:33:45\* FAX DAR USS AND COLNEE, OR STANDARD TAR AND COLNEE, OR STANDARD TO COLNEE,

## RELIEF REQUESTED

THEREFORE, Plaintiffs are entitled to:

- (a) a declaration that MRPC 3.5(c) and 6.5 are unconstitutional on their face;
- (b) a temporary restraining order, a preliminary injunction and, after final hearing, a permanent injunction precluding the Michigan Supreme Court, or any of its agencies, from enforcing MRPC 3.5(c) and 6.5;
- (c) any other relief as authorized under the laws including costs and attorney fees for bringing this action.

Respectfully submitted,

FIEGER, FIEGER, KENNEY & JOHNSON, P.C.

MICHAEL R. DEZSI (P64550

Attorney for Plaintiffs 19390 W. Ten Mile Road Southfield, Michigan 48075

(248) 355-5555

Dated: April 7, 2006

JS 44 11/99

The JS-44 civil cover sheet by law, except as provided for the use of the Clerk of				heet.		ngs or other papers as required September 1974, is required
1. (a) PLAINTIFFS G	eoffrey Fiege			DEFENDANT	S Michigan	Syrame Court
(b) County of Residence		arg Oaklanos	<u>/</u> <u> </u>	LAND I	NVOLVED.	Sypreme Court Kelly, Corrigan, Tugham GUSETHE LOCATION OF THE
(c) Attorneys (Name,	Address and Telephone	Number)		Attorneys (If K	nown)	•
Michael DEZS		A TOWN TO	<u> </u>	350		
19390 W. Ten M	(2)2		t syllen	ing		
Southfield, MI 4		-55-55 M	III. CI	35) TIZENSHIP OF PR	INCIPAL PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place on "X" in One Box Only)				or Diversity Cases Only	r)	and One Box for PLA DEF
☐ 1 U.S. Government (	Federal Questio (U.S. Governo	n. ment Not a Party)	Cit	PLA izen of This State	1 🏂 1 Incorporated	or Principal 4 🗓 ss In This State
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citiz in Item III)	zenship of Parties	Cit	tizen of Another □		d <i>end</i> Principal 😡 5 🗆 ess In Another State
•	(iii itelii ili)			tizen or Subject∗of : ⊡ Foreign Country	-3 □ 3 Foreign Nati	ion 6 0
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" i	n One Box Only)			•	
CONTRACT	TO	RTS PERSONAL INJU		ORFEITURE/PI Case 610 Agricult Assi	e: 2:06-cv-11684 gned To: Tarnow, Arth	
☐ 130 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of	320 Assault, Libel And Slander  330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability	□ 362 Personal Inju Med. Malpra □ 365 Personal Inju Product Liab □ 368 Asbestos Per Injury Produc Liability  PERSONAL PROPEI □ 370 Other Fraud □ 371 Truth in Len □ 380 Other Person	ry—	620 Other Fi Refe 625 Drug Reli Filed of Proper CMP 630 Liquor I RT, E 640 R.R. & Truck 650 Alrline Regs. 660 Occupational Safety/Health	rral Judge: Majzoub, M : 04-07-2006 At 01:37 FIEGER, ET AL V. M ET AL (TAM)  B 820 Copyrights B 830 Patent B 840 Trademark  SOCIAL SECURITY	MonaK ′PM
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	injury	Property Date 385 Property Date Product Liab	mage	710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	□ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405) □ 864 \$\$(D Title XVI	□ 892 Economic Stabilization Act □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 894 Energy Allocation Act
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITION  510 Motions to V	<del></del> -∤□	730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act	□ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act ☐ 900 Appeal of Fee
210 Land Condemnation 220 Foraclosure 230 Rant Lesse & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property		Sentence Habeas Corpus:    630 General   536 Death Penal	ty Other	740 Railway Labor Act 790 Other Labor Litigation	FEDERAL TAX SUITS  870 Taxes (U.S. Plaint or Defendant)  871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	Determination Under Equal Access to Justice
V. ORIGIN  ✓ ¥ <sup>1</sup> Original □ <sup>2</sup> I	Removed from C 3	OX ONLY)  Remanded from  Appellate Court	_ 4 o	from another 5 another	her district 👝 🗼	Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Itlon Judgment
VI. CAUSE OF ACT	10N (Cite the U.S. Civil )	Statute under which y	ou are fil	ing and write brief statem	ent of cause.	
	\$ /983 _ chall- I □ CHECK IF TH UNDER F.R.C	15 IS A CLASS AC	<u>cial y</u>	UMCOAS to totas A S DEMAND	D Mich Ruh	only if demanded in complaint:
VIII. RELATED CAS	SE(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NOMBER	(OVER-)
DATE 4-7-06	•	SIGNATURE OF	ATTORN	EY OF RECORD	<u>/</u>	

# **PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 83.11**

1.	Is this a case that has been previously dismissed?	□Yes 24 No
If yes	, give the following information:	
Court	t:	
Case	No.:	
Judge	e:	•
2.	Other than stated above, are there any pending or previously discontinued or dismissed companion cases in this or any other court, including state court? (Companion cases are matters in which it appears substantially similar evidence will be offered or the same or related parties are present and the cases arise out of the same transaction or occurrence.)	⊠Yes □ No
If yes	, give the following information:	
Court	1: E.D. Mich Sup Can	+
Case	1: E.D. Mich Sup Con No.: 05-72264 / 94-74375 / 1275-47	
Judge	e: BATTANT BORMAN Mich Syp., Cot	
Notes:	NONE of these cases were original actions under & A facially exconstitutional the Mich Rules of Part.	63 challensing as Conduct however
	Il in the Phinase File on the Mil F	1 1 1 X 1 1 X